

The Perennial Phantasy About Mr Myatt

A phantasy is an imagined or irrational belief or idea which has no factual evidence to support it; an irrational or imaginary depiction or hallucination of something or of some person(s) not actually present. A phantasist is a person who propagates a phantasy they believe in, either personally to others or by some medium of communication such as written or digital material.

A phantasy about a person does not need evidential facts to support it, for it is sufficient to repeat it, ad nauseam, to others personally or by modern means such as social media. For there are always individuals who will believe the phantasy is real if it is repeated often enough by many individuals, just as a zealous religious preacher or political propagandist can usually convince some people to accept their 'message' or 'revelation' or claim if they repeat it often enough, or if their audience believes them to be sincere or an authority about a particular matter.

The Perennial Phantasy

There are nine essential parts to the elaborate, decades-long, and recurring phantasy about David Myatt:

- I. That DM=AL and therefore that DM founded the Occult movement known by the acronyms ONA and O9A.
- II. That since DM founded the O9A he is responsible and/or accountable for what others, such as self-described O9A adherents or those alleged to be O9A adherents, do or have done or may do.
- III. That since AL promoted deception and misdirection, DM is deceptive, with DM's post-2012 writings about rejecting extremism and neo-nazism and about his philosophy of pathei-mathos therefore deceptive, part of some diabolical plan, and therefore can be ignored.
- IV. That DM is still a neo-nazi.
- V. That anyone who criticizes the phantasy or asks for evidence that DM=AL or who writes about Myatt in any positive way is DM.
- VI. That DM spends every day or almost every day searching for his name on the Internet and on social media.
- VII. That he posts on social media using a variety of pseudonyms in order to contradict the phantasy and post links to his post-2012 writings.
- VIII. That there is an academic consensus that DM=AL.
- IX. That, contrary to jurisprudence, it is for Myatt and not for them to prove (a) that he is not AL, and (b) that he is not behind the various pseudonyms or blogs or websites or articles or books who or which promote his works.

Claims I - VII

The salient reality is that no one has ever provided any probative evidence {1} for the claims/accusations made in parts I - VII. What is often used as 'proof' by those making the claims/accusations is the fallacy of appeal to authority {2} with their 'proof' thus the citation of some secondary source such as some published book(s) or article(s) or, more often, the tertiary Internet source called 'wikipedia' which is a collection of secondary sources.

What is often claimed to be evidence of part I and part VII is that there is a similarity of writing style, of writing in the same 'idiosyncratic way', of the use of certain terms and phrases. Yet when asked to provide evidence in the form of texts for comparison by DM and AL, the comparisons are either not provided or the claimants/accusers resort to the fallacy of appeal to authority by citing works such as those by Senholt, Goodrick-Clarke, and Introvigne whose claims about Myatt {3} (i) do not derive from primary, probative, sources but from secondary sources, or (ii) are personal opinion, or (iii) are based on the fallacy of incomplete evidence. {4}

In this matter of a claim regarding similarity of writing style, some phantasists have stated that they are prepared to hire a professional forensic linguist in order to confirm their claim, but (i) when asked to do so and publish the results they did not respond, and (ii) as described in the 2022 essay *Author Profiling In The Case Of David Myatt And Anton Long* {5} the forensic linguist would be faced with certain problems one of which would be

"the volume of material written by both Myatt and the pseudonymous Anton Long over several decades and given that the forensic profiler would have to subjectively select what texts from what years to compare. What would their subjective criteria for such a selection be? To compare a few texts from around the same time? To compare a few texts from the same decade? To compare just a few or dozens of texts from three or four decades?"

Both Myatt and 'Anton Long' have published thousands of texts, between the 1970s and 2012 in the case of Anton Long, and between the 1970s and 2025 in the case of Myatt.

Another problem would be the O9A *Manual of Style*, as described in that essay, where it is stated

"that certain O9A texts whether written by Anton Long himself or by his students may have deliberately copied aspects of Myatt's style, formatting, grammar and spelling in order to 'make certain people draw the fallacious conclusion they were intended to make', {6} and secondly that such a 'sinister' purpose combined with the use of the O9A manual of style was part of the O9A's Labyrinthos Mythologicus."

Claim VIII

In relation to part VIII there is no academic consensus. George Sieg stated that the identification is "implausible and untenable based on the extent of variance in writing style, personality, and tone." {7} In addition, other academics, such as Jeffrey Kaplan, have stated that Myatt and Long are separate people, {8} with others of the opinion that 'Anton

'Long' was a pseudonym used by multiple individuals over the last thirty years {9} and that it "is possible that Anton Long is a pseudonym used or appropriated by multiple O9A authors." {10}

Claim IX

A common tactic among the phantasists is the use of what is arguably a form of the fallacy of *petitio principii* and who thus phrase the phantasy or parts of it in the form of a question to which question they provide the expected answer. For example, "who else apart from Myatt would be so zealous about Myatt/about replying to posts about him/about posting links to his works/ other than Myatt himself?"

To which question(s) they expect or demand a reply, either not knowing or conveniently ignoring the salient, logical, reality that it is for the accuser, for those making an accusation of accusations, not the accused, to provide evidence, in the absence of which a claim or accusation remain just an unsubstantiated claim or accusation.

A common feature or trope {11} among those who believe in the phantasy and who propagate it in whatever manner is the use, intentionally or otherwise, of the große Lüge (Big Lie) propaganda technique. Which is when a lie or accusation – or several lies or accusations – about a person, or persons, or group, is or are repeated so often by so many and by various means that a large proportion of people accept the lie or lies or accusation(s) as fact even though nothing probative in support of such lies and allegations is ever presented.

The technique is mainly based upon the fallacy of ad populum which is when a person either 'follows the crowd' and believes or claims that because so many others have claimed or believe something it is probably true, or when they are convinced, usually emotively, by a propagandist or politician or by some populist speaker that something is true or that someone or some many are guilty or culpable.

Conclusion

Despite there being no evidence whatsoever from primary sources for the phantasy about Mr Myatt, it is believed by thousands of people around the world usually on the basis of the fallacy of appeal to authority. It is also assiduously propagated by phantasists on an almost daily basis often by the medium of the Internet and either (i) because the phantasist is politically motivated and adheres to slogans such as "never forgive, never forget" or (ii) because the phantasist has been emotively persuaded by someone or by some propaganda that Myatt is 'evil' and/or a terrorist who founded and is still influential in a now "prolific neo-nazi terror network" responsible for multiple murders worldwide, and who also founded and is still influential in an Occult movement.

In terms of propaganda, in 2021 Myatt was listed by the policy group the Counter Extremism Project (CEP) as one of the twenty most dangerous extremists in the world {12} and, in conformity with the phantasy and thus without citing any primary sources, the CEP described Myatt as "the founder of The Order of Nine Angles".

This belief and the spread of such propaganda is symptomatic of the zeitgeist of our times where the opinions and the interpretations of others about a matter or about a person are rapidly spread and often readily believed with the quiet, the cultured, the civilized, the scholarly, art of acquiring knowledge of a matter or of a person by personal research over an extended period using primary sources unknown or unappreciated and certainly seldom practised among the general populace and even by journalists and many academics.

In the matter of the perennial phantasy about Mr Myatt and of such a civilized art it is perhaps only fitting to quote what Myatt wrote in 2012; that

"those who use [the] Media, and/or unscholarly books/essays, as sources of allegedly reliable information, as a guide, as a or as the basis for their judgement about and knowledge of someone or some many, are being unfair and uncultured because lacking in the following necessary virtues: (i) a reasoned, balanced, and thus ethical, judgement; (ii) the empathy of manifold direct personal contacts; and (ii) a scholarly research and/or a personal knowing extending over many years.

Virtues which are the genesis of a genuine understanding of, and thence an unbiased knowledge of, another human being; and virtues which rapid, impersonal, mass means of modern communication actively discourage and which virtues are seldom, it seems, cultivated and employed by those involved with and who use and who rely on such modern means for information." {13}

In his 2024 text *Research, Primary Sources, And Pathei-Mathos* he wrote that he "regarded and regard reason, logical reasoning, and scholarship using primary sources, as essential human virtues." {14}

However, we and the few others who in this digital era acknowledge the value of the art of scholarship, have no illusions regarding the phantasy about Mr Myatt: his words and our words, his post-2011 essays and ours, will neither stop the propagation of such a phantasy nor prevent susceptible and receptive others from believing it.

Yet as TS Eliot, Myatt's favourite modern poet, wrote:

Midwinter spring is its own season
Sempiternal though sodden towards sundown,
Suspended in time, between pole and tropic ...

If you came this way,
Taking any route, starting from anywhere,
At any time or at any season,
It would always be the same.

Rufus Malisius et al
2025

.....

{1} As noted in the Appendix, probative evidence is evidence which provides proof regarding a claim or an assertion or reveals the facts about an event or an occurrence or which on the balance of probability provides such proof.

While most often used in a legal sense in a trial in an established Court of Law, the term is also applicable in the matter of scholarly research using primary sources concerning an event (historical or otherwise) or concerning a person.

{2} The fallacy of appeal to authority is described in the Appendix.

{3} qv. *Part One: A Critical Analysis: Senholt, Goodrick-Clarke, And Introvigne, of An Analysis Of The Equation DM=AL*, <https://archive.org/download/dmyatt-equals-anton-long/dmyatt-equals-anton-long.pdf>

{4} The fallacy of incomplete evidence is described in the Appendix. See also the section on Senholt in *A Critical Analysis: Senholt, Goodrick-Clarke, And Introvigne, of An Analysis Of The Equation DM=AL*, q.v.

{5} <https://archive.org/download/dm-o9a-author-profiling/dm-o9a-author-profiling.pdf>

{6} The reference is to a typewritten letter dated 28th August 103 yf (1992 ev) which is reproduced in facsimile in volume one of *The Satanic Letters of Stephen Brown*, <https://archive.org/download/satanicletters-1/satanicletters-1.pdf>

{7} *Angular Momentum: From Traditional to Progressive Satanism in the Order of Nine Angles*. International Journal for the Study of New Religions, volume 4, number 2. 2013. p.257.

{8} *Religiosity and the Radical Right: Toward the Creation of a New Ethnic Identity*, in Jeffrey Kaplan and Tore Bjørgo (editors), *Nation and Race: The Developing Euro-American Racist Subculture*. Northeastern University Press. 1998. p.115.

{9} *Mysticism in the 21st Century*. Sirius Academic Press. 2013. p.92.

{10} Daveed Gartenstein-Ross & Emelie Chace-Donahue, *The Order of Nine Angles: Cosmology, Practice & Movement*, Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 2023. DOI: 10.1080/1057610X.2023.2186737

{11} A trope is defined in the Appendix.

{12} <https://web.archive.org/web/20210126120934/https://www.counterextremism.com/content/top-20-extremists>

It is perhaps relevant that the CEP is financed by several Western governments, including the United States, and in its own words is "led by a renowned group of former world leaders and diplomats".

{13} *A Matter of Honour*, <https://davidmyatt.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/a-matter-of-honour.pdf>

{14} <https://davidmyatt.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/myatt-a-neglected-aspect.pdf>

Appendix Glossary Of Terms

Trope

"Where the Trope is far fetch'd, and hard, 'tis fit for nothing but to puzzle the Understanding", John Dryden, Juvenal (1697)

A trope is a figure of speech (verbal and written) which is far fetched; a motif, a motive or theme, that represents something which is illogical (such as a fallacy of reasoning) or which is unproven or hearsay or propaganda. The fallacies of reasoning include the appeal to authority and ad populum.

One example of a trope in common use is belief in and the propagation of a phantasy about a person; which phantasy, given the nature of fantasies, does not require any evidence to sustain it or for it to be believed.

Fairness And Jurisprudence

In the lands of the West, as often elsewhere in the world, the virtue of fairness has for centuries been admired with its cultivation in the individual regarded as a necessity for a civilized, cultured, society, based as the virtue was on restrained personal behaviour. The virtue was enshrined in one of the principles of Western jurisprudence: that the burden of proof is on the person who accuses not on the accused. Hence the fairness of the presumption of innocence until probative evidence proves otherwise.

The civilized rule, the fair thing to do, was that unless a person had done their own research using primary source material or had personal direct contemporaneous experience of an event or had extensive personal experience of a group, or personally knew a person over an extended period of time, then they reserved their judgment and did not venture forth, did not publicly give, their opinion. In respect of a person, accused of something or the subject of rumours, they gave them the benefit of the doubt until probative evidence proved otherwise.

Probative Evidence

Probative evidence is evidence which provides proof regarding a claim or an assertion or reveals the facts about an event or an occurrence or which on the balance of probability provides such proof.

While most often used in a legal sense in a trial in an established Court of Law, the term is also applicable in the matter of scholarly research using primary sources concerning an event (historical or otherwise) or concerning a person.

Scholarly

To be learned, to be a scholar in the traditional sense, is to have a profound knowledge gained by individual study. The criteria of scholarship are: (i) a detailed, meticulous, unbiased original research on and concerning a specific topic or topics or subject or person undertaken over a period of time, usually a year or more in duration and involving primary source material; (ii) an ability to be able to read primary sources in their original language; and (iii) a rational assessment of the knowledge acquired by such research, with such conclusions about the topic, topics, or subject being the logical result of the cumulative scholarly learning so acquired. If the researcher cannot read primary sources in their original language and has to rely on the translations of others then their conclusions are not original and not scholarly just as if they commit logical fallacies - such as the fallacy of Incomplete Evidence - then their conclusions are also not scholarly.

Fallacy Of Appeal To Authority

The fallacy of appeal to authority, also known as the fallacy of Argumentum ad Verecundiam, is somewhat misunderstood in this age of the Internet. It is not only citing or quoting a person or persons who is/are regarded, by the person citing or quoting or by others, as an authority or 'expert' on a subject but also citing or quoting the opinion given by some institution, or 'policy/advisory group' or similar, on a subject, regardless of whether or not the 'expert' or institution or whatever has their opinion published by some means or some medium regarded as 'mainstream', academic, or 'respectable' or authoritative.

The crux of the fallacy is a reliance by someone or by some others on who or what is regarded in a particular society as an authority on or as having a detailed or 'expert' knowledge of a subject or subjects.

Thus a statement such as the fallacy of appeal to authority "is when the opinion of a non-expert on a topic is used as evidence" is itself fallacious because although it appears to be a decisive statement regarding 'authority' it is logically not so having not only restricted the fallacy to those who are not 'experts' but does not define what an 'expert' or a 'false expert' is or are or who or what person or institution, or 'policy/advisory group' or similar has the 'authority' to declare someone an 'expert' or a 'false expert' in a certain subject or subjects, and from whence a person or an institution, or 'policy/advisory group' or similar derives their own authority to make such declarations.

The corollary of the appeal to authority is personal research by scholarly means of a subject using primary sources.

Primary Sources

Primary sources include contemporaneous manuscripts, letters, diaries, memoirs, personal journals, interviews, speeches, and other materials individuals used to describe (i) events in which they were participants or observers, and (ii) ideas or creations - such as a philosophy, music, literature, or art-work - which they were responsible for. Hence in the matter of a philosophy such as that of Heidegger the primary sources are his published writings, authenticated recordings or transcriptions of his speeches/lectures, and authenticated unpublished manuscripts if any. The writings, opinions, and conclusions of others about that philosophy, and other translations of his work, are secondary sources, with compilations of quotations from such secondary sources, a tertiary source.

Fallacy Of Ad Populum

This is when a person either 'follows the crowd' and believes or claims that because so many others have claimed or believe something it is probably true, or when they are convinced, usually emotively, by a propagandist or politician or by some populist speaker that something is true or that someone or some many are guilty or culpable.

Fallacy Of Argumentum ad Hominem

Argumentum ad hominem is when the character and/or the motives and/or the identity of the person presenting an argument is/are maligned or called into question often in an attempt to deflect attention away from the topic being discussed or from the opponents failure to answer questions asked of them or provide the evidence they were asked to provide.

Fallacy of Composition

Also known as the Fallacy of Illicit Transference. This is an example of equivocation, and is when a generalization is made from a few specific instances or examples with the generalization then applied to pejoratively describe or malign a group or organization or person.

Fallacy Of The False Cause

Generally referred to by the Latin phrase *non causa pro causa*. This fallacy is the assumption that one thing is the cause of another without any logical reasoning.

Fallacy Of Incomplete Evidence

Also known as the fallacy of suppressed evidence. This is when evidence which disproves or may disprove a claim or conclusion is not considered either deliberately (suppressed evidence) or because of a lack of detailed and scholarly research.

.....

Appendix Source:

Rational Discourse, Logical Reasoning, And The Internet

https://archive.org/download/rational-discourse-internet/Rational_Discourse_Internet.pdf

Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivs 4.0 license